



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/052,744	03/31/98	HAMDI	R CCC1P020/P15

TM02/1130  
GARY R. STANFORD  
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD, LLLP  
816 CONGRESS AVENUE  
SUITE 1900  
AUSTIN TX 78701

EXAMINER

ELAMIN, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED:

11/30/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/052,744

Applicant(s)

HAMDI et al

Examiner

Abdelmoniem Elamin

Group Art Unit

2182



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Abdelmoniem Elamin

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Russel C. Scott

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Nov 17, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Burnett et al, US. Pat. No. 5,870,080

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant argues in substance that Burnett fails to teach a peripheral hub device. However, Examiner referred Applicant to Burnett, column 7, lines 28-31, 55-56. In this section, it clearly shows that Burnett's system is capable of sending and receiving signals between the transceiver and any device (being a peripheral device or a peripheral hub device) having a corresponding transceiver.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

THOMAS LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.